A Blacklist Like South Africa's to Stifle Dissent, Pps. 3-4

Semper Fidelis

"Goldwater Backs Shift of McNamara"—Associated Press *dispatch from Phoenix, Arizona, Nov. 29.*

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. XV, NO. 30 DECEMBER 11, 1967 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

A Graceful Patsy Against A Dirty Fighter?

We have ourselves a candidate against Lyndon Johnson in the Democratic primaries but unless he picks up steam he's not going to set any voters on fire. Senator Eugene McCarthy was supposed to be the main attraction at the Conference of Concerned Democrats in Chicago last week-end. But his speech—like the one he delivered a few weeks earlier before SANE's national meeting in Chicago for labor leaders against the war in Vietnam—fell flat. He has wit, charm and grace. But he seems to lack heart and guts. This may seem a strange thing to say of the only Democrat willing to step out and challenge Johnson for the nomination. Unfortunately it seems to be true. Watching him at the press conference here at which he launched his candidacy, one began to wonder why he was running at all. A certain cynicism and defeatism seems basic to the man. This is no way to embark on a fight. His hero, Adlai, was a Hamlet. McCarthy gives one the uneasy feeling that he doesn't really give a damn.

A Half-Hearted Battle Won't Do

The dreadful thing about presidential campaigns is that they make liars of us all. We join up, and stop saying what we think, for the good of the cause. I suppose I'll be swept up in this same kind of nonsense myself. But at least at the beginning a few honest words may be useful. We have to support McCarthy. A poor showing in the primaries for McCarthy will be a poor showing for peace. But he's also got to support us. And himself. It's no easy matter for a politician to challenge the head of his party. It may be political suicide. To embark on so risky an undertaking half-heartedly is the worst possible policy. The only safety lies in shooting the works. There's no other way to a long-shot victory and anyway that's the way to enjoy a wonderful, even if losing, battle in a good cause. If McCarthy couldn't evoke enthusiasm from dissident laborites and dissident Democrats just dying for a new hero to cheer—how's he going to do out in the sticks? Where the audiences are cold? Or half hawk? Or just curious?

One purpose of the intra-party fight against Johnson, as McCarthy and Bobby Kennedy have been saying, is to restore the faith of youth in normal politics and—as they might put it privately—"get them off the streets." McCarthy's going to have to do a lot better than he has so far if he's going to make much of a dent among the disaffected youth and Negroes—though at least he, unlike Bobby, is willing to lay his political future on the line to fight the war. What has to be improved first of all is how McCarthy says it. He just doesn't transmit any sense of passion. Secondly what he does say isn't good enough. The Chicago speech was full of insincere hokum. A sample: "John Kennedy set free the spirit of America. The honest optimism was released." McCarthy doesn't believe it, so why say it? And poor Adlai reduced to the role of Kennedy's UN errand boy would have been surprised to learn that his ideas were revived by Kennedy. Where? At the Bay of Pigs? We would also be glad to spare some of McCarthy's fancy quotes at Chicago from Péguy on Dreyfus and Toynbee on the Punic wars for a little more clarity on Vietnam. It's Ho, not Hannibal, who concerns us now.

McCarthy is remarkably unclear about Vietnam. The Chicago speech showed lazy staff work when he invoked the names of Eisenhower and Bradley among those who had warned us against a land war in Asia—although these two dippy old duffers only a few days before were calling for an invasion of North Vietnam! Most revealing of all were his answers at the Washington press conference. Little attention was paid these by the press (1) because the chief interest seemed to be in politics and personality and (2) most of the Washington press corps is for—or indifferent to—the war. At the bottom of page two we give the answers in which he discussed the substantative issues. These are pretty appalling. The clearest and simplest appeal McCarthy can make is to say that Johnson broke his 1964 pledges and has

(*Continued on Page Two*)

Does LBJ Want A New McCarthyism?

LBJ's itch for a new era of McCarthyism may lie hidden behind the new bill just passed by the House to enable the Attorney General and the Subversive Activities Control Board to set up a public blacklist of radical organizations on the Left (though not the right). The bill would revive in new form the powers of the Subversive Activities Control Board which had been rendered moribund by adverse Supreme Court decisions. Behind the passage of HR 12601 by the House Nov. 28 lies a dramatic contrast between Truman and Johnson. The Internal Security Act of 1950, which set up the SACB, was passed in the wake of anti-Leftist hysteria during the Korean war. Truman vetoed it. Johnson, then in the Senate, voted to override the veto. Now under cover of the Vietnamese war and racial disturbances this bill to revive the SACB and establish a blacklist turned up under strange auspices.

(Continued on Page Three)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(*Continued from Page One*)

adopted more and more of Goldwater's policies. That is true. Everybody can understand it. It's effective. Indeed there's little else he needs to say. But, as the reader will see, McCarthy said "I'm not going to talk about that in the campaign." That one remark really tells the whole story. Is he going to run a cream-puff campaign against as tough and dirty a fighter as Lyndon B.?

All Fuzz on Bombing

McCarthy will stir no enthusiasm if he goes around being a graceful patsy. One of the main functions of the campaign is to educate the electorate and to prepare the way for wiser policies. One main line is evident and needs to be hammered on over and over again. The choice is not between isolationism and internationalism. It's between wasting our blood and wealth in the attempt to enforce a Pax Americana or becoming a loyal member of the United Nations. Somebody has to say out loud that we can't take over the white man's burden in the new Kennedy-era guise of Green Berets and counter-insurgency. Over and over again somebody must say clearly as the way to peace "stop the bombing" and "negotiate a coalition government" in South Vietnam. It is Johnson strategy to ignore the fact that U Thant and others have said over and over again that talks will follow if the bombing ends. McCarthy's reply on bombing was all fuzz. It is also Administration strategy to distract attention from the fact that the new NLF program offers a viable compromise solution. I suspect McCarthy's never even seen it. He needs to do some hard thinking and fresh study if he's to be effective. His most alarming reply was on containment of China. There he said we didn't need Vietnam because we now have a new base in Thailand! That is, a second Vietnam, simmering on the burner?

We enlist in McCarthy's army but we intend to keep stirring up mutiny until the General stops yawning.

The Silly Effort to Equate Ho With Hitler

"The wicked war in Vietnam is the natural fruit of the turn to the right in foreign policy. It is only a symptom of a sick and misguided view of our role in the world. Unless a new direction is taken, there will be other Vietnams. Our foreign policy today reverts to a simplistic view of an aggressive, monolithic, world communist conspiracy, a view little revised since the days of Stalin. . . . We heard the President cite Southeast Asia as 'the area where communist expansion is most aggressively at work in the world today. I would rather stand in Vietnam' he declared, 'in our time, and by meeting this danger now, and facing up to it, thereby reduce the dangers for our children and our grandchildren'.

"Can the President and his Secretary of State seriously believe that Ho Chi Minh, with his ragged bands and ruined cities, without an air force or navy, presents America and the world with a threat comparable to Hitler in the 30s or Stalin in the 40s?"

—Keynote Address, Conference of Concerned Democrats, Chicago, Dec. 2 by Don Edwards* (Calif.), *only member of Congress who had the nerve to take part.

Sen. McCarthy's Replies to Questions At His Washington Press Conference Nov. 30

Q. Senator, do you think President Johnson has gone back in any way on his 1964 campaign pledge not to send American boys to do the work of Asian boys?

A. I'm not going to talk about that in the campaign. I'd hesitate to say he's gone back on a pledge. I think there's been a significant change in policy from what was indicated in 1964, but I don't want to make the case in terms of any kind of betrayal or deception, deception of the public in terms of what he said in 1964.

Q. Senator, if elected, how would you end the war?

A. That is rather a big question. What we are concerned about now is trying to indicate a change of policy at this point. I see no indication of a change of policy. Once you've turned the policy around then you have to talk to the Defense Department and look at the tactical situation but I think there is sufficient reason to believe that a scheduled withdrawal with pauses [sic] and try to negotiate, that this is entirely feasible and we could work out some kind of negotiation or settlement.

Q. Senator, if we withdraw from Vietnam, where do you believe we ought to take a stand against communism?

A. I think that there are many places where you could take a stand against communism. If we are really concerned about the expansion of Chinese communism, it seems to me that to waste our manpower and resources where we are doing it in Vietnam would be the worst of all possible choices. We still have the fleet, we still have the position in Japan, we still have a position in South Korea, we have built up a strong base in Thailand; the fear of some kind of great Chinese expansion into Southeast Asia is of less significance than it was before that base was established. I don't see any danger of being engulfed and overrun by the Communists in Southeast Asia.

Q. Senator, could you give us your views on the bombing of the North? Do you differ from the Administration on that?

A. I thought that the bombing should not have been resumed as it was in January 1966. As Sen. Kennedy and others have indicated, there was, I think, a reasonably good chance to negotiate something at that time, and if we had not resumed the bombing, the prospects of negotiation would have been improved. So far as the bombing last January, I did not particularly join in urging that bombing not be resumed or that it be stopped at that time, because I thought there was no evidence of an intent to negotiate, and that simply stopping the bombing without some other movement on our part by way of a unilateral limitation of our military effort in South Vietnam would not have any meaning. I would be glad to have them stop bombing the civilian areas and concentrate on supply routes today, if they could be persuaded to do that. But I don't think that just stopping the bombing is a significant kind of offer that might lead to negotiations.

Q. Do you think that President Johnson has deliberately overlooked opportunities for negotiation?

A. I think as Sen. Kennedy has said, that there were occasions when there were some openings for negotiations. So far as the public position taken by the Administration as a basis for negotiations, I don't think that these have really been negotiable positions. When you say "If you stop supplying your troops and infiltrating, we'll stop bombing," this is not, in my judgment, really a negotiable offer.

A. Senator, could you clarify the change in policy since 1964, as you see it?

A. It's no qualitative difference, I think it's just been a kind of quantitative escalation and at some point you make a prudential judgment that what good you can get out of the war is not proportionate to destruction of life and property and the draining away of moral energy which goes along with the pursuit of the war in the way in which we are now pursuing it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Mansfield Amendment Was No More Than An Exercise in Liberal Self-Delusion

Sneaky Tactics — As If the White House Was Ashamed of the Bill

(*Continued from Page One*)

In the Senate it was introduced by the Republican leader, Dirksen, and in the House by Willis (*D. La.*) of the Un-American Activities Committee. It represented the handiwork of this committee and of its witch-hunting twin, the Senate Internal Security Committee. Dirksen claimed that it had the President's support. So did Willis. "I happen to know," he told the House, "that the President is personally for the bill. . . . He said that to a high official of the government." McCormack and Carl Albert, in lining up votes for it, also said privately that Johnson was for the bill.

Father and Son Contrast

There is something sneaky about the whole affair, as if the White House were ashamed openly to support the bill. After all, it hardly fits the claim of Johnson's official biographers that he helped to defeat McCarthy (a boast for which there is no tangible evidence). The suspicion that Johnson is behind the bill draws strength from the silence of the Attorney General. His father, Tom Clark, as Truman's Attorney General, testified against the original Internal Security Act. Ramsey Clark is far more of a civil libertarian than his father. But it now appears from the debate in the Senate that as long ago as last April 13, Chairman Eastland of Internal Security sent the Attorney General a letter asking whether he objected to the bill. Clark never replied.

The silence of the Attorney General casts considerable doubt on the value of the compromise accepted by all the Senate liberals except Bartlett of Alaska and Bobby Kennedy. This was an amendment by Mansfield that the law would die on June 30, 1969, if its powers had not been used before then by the Attorney General. It is the Attorney General under the new bill as under the original Act who would have to initiate any new proceedings before the SACB to blacklist "Communist action", "Communist front" or "Communist infiltrated" organizations. The Amendment was accepted by Proxmire of Wisconsin, who led the fight against the bill, on the ground (as he told the Senate) that the Attorney General because of "his dedication to our traditional freedom

(*Continued on Page Four*)

A HUAC Rebel Protest

"The very existence of the Subversive Activities Control Board compromises the First amendment. . . . To grant such frightening power [to establish a public blacklist of organizations deemed Communist or 'Communist infiltrated'] to a bureaucrat, to five men or indeed to [any] Government official . . . is most dangerous and irresponsible because it may only serve to stifle dissent—it may only serve to kill expression of controversial views in this Nation.

"To the extent that it denies political vitality and vigor of our own free institutions, then it clearly aids and abets the Communist movement. As President Truman said in his veto message of the Internal Security Act setting up the SACB in 1950 'We need not fear the expression of ideas—we do need to fear their suppression.' Because in a democratic society, freedom of expression permits criticism and criticism permits progress."

—John C. Culver (D. Iowa) *opposing passage of the SACB "blacklist bill" in the House Nov. 28. Mr. Culver, a member of HUAC, voted against the bill when it was reported out of that Committee 8-to-1 on Oct. 4.*

An Irresponsible Charge Against the Communists In A Very Dangerous Situation

"Every informed citizen is aware that just last month the Communist Party openly came out in support of Negro violence and rioting—and that it had been covertly agitating to provoke racial violence."

Tuck (D. Va.) *of the Un-American Activities Committee during debate on new SACB "blacklist" bill Nov. 28.*

"Communists believe in the use of violence to achieve political objectives only when reaction has closed off the channels whereby a majority of the people can realize their objectives by peaceful means. As we see it today, the overwhelming majority of the American people, including black people, are not yet convinced that the system must be changed, much less that it is necessary to do so by armed force. . . . We therefore reject today the organization of armed uprisings in the black communities. . . . We believe that conspiratorial, terroristic actions . . . are reckless and adventurous, provocative and politically irresponsible . . . inviting reprisals upon the black community.

"Black communities, of course, have the right to take all measures to defend themselves. . . . But the real task at hand is to rally nationwide support, particularly the support of all truly democratic white Americans, especially white workers, to stop the annual 'summer slaughter' and to aid the struggle for survival of the black Americans. The Open Letter by the Communist Party, USA, addressed to the President before the 'hot summer' of 1967 exploded, called for 'united action of all forces on the Left regardless of differences' and . . . to 'unite all Americans of conscience, black and white', . . .

"It is wrong to conclude, as some do, from the stubborn refusal of the power structure and the Johnson Administration to deal adequately with the crisis in the black ghettoes, that the channels for democratic change are closed to the black people. . . . On the contrary, in the past decade the Negro people have achieved the strongest political position ever attained in our country. . . .

"The costly experience of Hitler fascism should serve to remind revolutionaries and democrats alike of the terrible price paid for failure to defend each precious democratic right to the bitter end. Many white people . . . have responded with fear to the uprisings in the black ghettoes. The racists have been quick to seize on these fears . . . a dangerous situation is developing which can turn our streets into bloody battlegrounds of racial strife. But there are also developing among increasing numbers of white people significant new levels of understanding of the meaning of full equality for black people. . . . Thus the basis for achieving higher levels of black-white unity exist."

—Policy statement on the Negro question by Henry Winston, chairman of the Communist Party, Nov. 6, after a special conference called by the Party's Negro Affairs Commission headed by Claude Lightfoot. Both Mr. Winston and Mr. Lightfoot are Negro Smith Act victims. Mr. Winston lost his sight due to prison negligence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Brooke, First Negro Senator Since Reconstruction, Tried to Abolish the SACB Altogether

A Blacklist Like South Africa's to Stifle All Protests Against Apartheid

(*Continued from Page Three*)

and cherished personal liberties" would not use the Act and thus allow it to die.

But at this point Dirksen pulled from his pocket a cryptic three-sentence letter sent him by the Attorney General in reply to a letter asking what course of action Clark would follow if the bill were passed. Clark said proceedings would be initiated "as evidence warrants, consistent with the Constitution and the standards of the Act." This is pretty slim grounds for hope. Truman's then Attorney General, McGrath, filed the first action under the Act two months after it was passed over Truman's veto, even though Truman declared that it was unconstitutional. It is hard to believe that Ramsey Clark would defy White House and Congressional pressure to enforce the new bill if and when it becomes law.

Proxmire's Last Minute Stand

Even this wistful hope is threatened now. The House bill contains no such amendment. The Senate conferees are all right-wingers: Eastland, Ervin, McClellan, Dirksen and Hruska. They could easily agree to accept the House version. Last Monday Proxmire warned the Senate that he would fight any conference report which recommended the omission of the Mansfield amendment. It thus may play some role as a last-minute delaying action, if Proxmire gets enough support on the Senate floor. The next step would be a public campaign to put Johnson on the spot and demand that he, like Truman, veto the bill.

Supreme Court decisions enforcing Fifth amendment guarantees against self-incrimination make it impossible any longer for the SACB to enforce self-registration of "communistic" organizations. The new bill would direct the Attorney General and the SACB to maintain instead a public blacklist of organizations they deemed subversive. This resembles the "naming" provisions of South Africa's Suppression of Communism Act under which virtually all opponents of apartheid, whether Communist or not, have been effectively ostracized and silenced.

Have We Learned Nothing From That Recent Past?

"The most serious aspects of this bill involve not what it alters but what it leaves unchanged. The restrictions on freedom of association inherent in the original act are unchanged. The definitions of 'Communist action' and 'Communist front' are so vague as to raise serious questions. 'Communist infiltrated' is undefinable on its face. If one Communist joins an organization and seeks to influence its policies, is the organization thereby permanently polluted? Communists have sought to influence every progressive movement. . . . Let us look closely at this bill before we vote. The witch hunts of the 1950s are over. Did we learn nothing from them? Have we forgotten the degradation, the denial of democratic freedoms, the smearing of the reputations, and destruction of human dignity that took place? Have we no faith in the intelligence and integrity of the American people?"

—*Ryan* (D.N.Y.) *against the blacklist bill Nov. 28.*

There was a satisfying symbolism in the fact that Brooke of Massachusetts, the first Negro Senator since Reconstruction, should have submitted a bill to abolish the SACB altogether. But this was defeated 58 to 17. The Dirksen bill with the Mansfield amendment passed 65 to 10. The opposition did better in the House, where the vote was 269 to 104, thanks largely to the eloquent and principled opposition of a maverick member of the Un-American Activities Committee, Culver (*D. Iowa*) who filed a dissenting report within the committee and made a strong speech against the bill on the floor (see box p. 3).

Another difference between the battle now and in 1950 is that then young John F. Kennedy (like Richard Nixon) voted to override Truman's veto of this thought control measure. This time the two Kennedy brothers voted against final passage and Robert Kennedy made one of the strongest speeches in opposition. Only Johnson seems to be unchanged.

Tickets for the Joint Birthday Party at Town Hall Next Jan. 19 (Stone's 60th, the Weekly's 15th) Are Going Fast. Better Get Your Reservations In Early. Only $1. Please Send Addressed Return Envelope With Your Order.

I. F. Stone's Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington, D. C. 20015

For the enclosed $6.95 send I. F. Stone's new book:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

Indicate if gift announcement wished ☐

Please renew (or enter) a sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City ..... Zip..... State.....

12/11/67

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

We'll Send Free Sample Copies of This Issue to Your Friends If You Send Us Stamped, Addressed Envelopes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED